

R E M A R K S

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner for his courtesy in granting the recent interview held with newly appointed Counsel, on January 18, 2006, at which time new, more detailed claim 1 was discussed. Claim 1 distinguishes over cited art, as follows:

Poole 5,797,692 lacks c), d) and e) (in particular) of claim 1 and the multiple functions, as in c), d), and e) of claim 1);

Lobdell 5,890,630 also lacks c), d), and e) of claim 1, the dimensions in d) of claim 1;

Pearce 2,716,251 is from the remote grease applicator art; and he lacks c), d), and e) of claim 1;

Mandanas and other cited art appear no more pertinent than the above references.

All other claims are dependent from claim 1, and new dependent claims 22-25 are added, no cited art suggesting their totalities.

Since there is now only one base claim from which all dependent claims are dependent, it is believed that all claims should now be allowable. Claim 27 should be allowable for reasons supporting allowability of claim 1,

Serial No. 10/628,097

and including the numerical width definition of the nozzle opening, to achieve wide, low thickness spreading.

Withdrawal of ¶'s 1-12 objections (see Action dated 11-02-05) is respectfully solicited, in view of newly appointed Examiner's approach to this case. Withdrawal of ¶'s 14-29 objections (to claims) is also respectfully requested in view of re-written base claim 1.

A call to Counsel to discuss any remaining issue is respectfully solicited. Allowance is urged.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Haefliger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 17,120
(323) 684-2707

WWH:ts
Docket 12,534